



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,539	04/22/2004	William Taylor	20103/030294	7334
83417	7590	03/13/2009		
AT&T Legal Department - HFZ				
ATTN: Patent Docketing				
One AT&T Way				
Room 2A-207				
Bedminster, NJ 07921				
EXAMINER				
SHIVERS, ASHLEY L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2419				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/13/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/829,539

Applicant(s)

TAYLOR ET AL.

Examiner

ASHLEY L. SHIVERS

Art Unit

2419

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb. 19, 2009 (Applicant's Amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 15-23 and 26-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 15-23 and 26-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on February 19, 2009 has been entered. Claims 1-26 have been amended. Claims 13-14 and 24-25 are canceled. Claims 27-32 have been added. Claims 1-11, 15-23 and 26-32 are still pending in this application, with claims 1, 15 and 26 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-11, 15-23 and 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In independent claims 1, 15 and 26, Applicants state that the provisioning of the various elements is being performed without manual intervention, but there is no support for the lack of manual intervention in the specification, thereby rendering this new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 15-18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibbitt et al. (**U.S. Patent No. 5,065,392**), hereinafter referred to as Sibbitt in view of Wilkes (**U.S. Patent No. 5,539,817**), hereinafter referred to as Wilkes.

Regarding claim 1, Sibbitt teaches a method for provisioning logical circuits for intermittent use in a data network, the method comprising:

receiving at least one customer order for routing data in the data network for a predetermined time period (**An end user at any node can log into the controller and send instructions as to the bandwidth desired between nodes and the exact time that such bandwidth will be required; See col. 2, lines 36-39**);

provisioning at least one logical circuit in the data network for routing the customer data during the predetermined time period (**The controller determines that the end user has authorization to use the requested bandwidth during the time of the requested period and then looks for channels of the communication facilities between the end points requested which will be idle during the prospective time period. Once the path is identified, then available bandwidth through the path must be selected and reserved. Once this is accomplished, the prospective routing is scheduled for use by the initiating end user during the requested time period; See col. 2, lines 40-46 and 49-53;**

adding the at least one logical circuit to a deletion batch (**The original request includes the disconnection time, therefore all connections that are scheduled to be disconnected at the same time will be in the same deletion batch; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12;**) and

disconnecting the at least one logical circuit at the end of the predetermined time period (**The end time of the active circuit is interpreted as disconnection of the circuit; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12).**

While Sibbitt teaches of looking for and reserving channels associated with the communication facilities in the path identified, Sibbitt fails to explicitly teach of the various communication facilities associated with the path.

Wilkes teaches of the communication facilities being used. In Fig. 3A, Wilkes shows the two LATAs and the IEC as well as the paths associated with the LATAs and the links between the LATAs and the IEC (**LATA#1, LATA#2 and IEC; See Fig. 3A**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Sibbitt to include the LATAs and the IEC along with the communication paths associated with the three components taught by Wilkes in order to provide the detailed communication path being used by the circuit in the network.

Regarding claim 2, Sibbitt further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein provisioning the at least one logical circuit comprises provisioning the at least one logical circuit prior to the start of the predetermined time period (**At the scheduled period of time, or slightly therebefore, the controller begins an assessment of the continued availability of the previously selected channels to insure that quality communications will be possible during the scheduled period; See col. 2, lines 54-57**).

Regarding claim 3, Sibbitt further teaches the method of claim 2, wherein provisioning the at least one logical circuit prior to the start of the predetermined time period comprises:

determining a maintenance window prior to the start of the predetermined time period (**The original request includes the connection time, which can be used as the maintenance window; See Fig. 10, #1006 and Fig. 12;** and

provisioning the at least one logical circuit during the maintenance window (**Provisioning of the circuit occurs during the time requested; See Fig. 10, #1006 and Fig. 12).**

Regarding claim 4, Sibbitt further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein disconnecting the at least one logical circuit at the end of the predetermined time period comprises disconnecting the at least one logical circuit following the end of the predetermined time period (**The original request includes the disconnection time, therefore the end time of the active circuit is interpreted as disconnection of the circuit; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12).**

Regarding claim 5, Sibbitt further teaches the method of claim 4, wherein disconnecting the at least one logical circuit following the end of the predetermined time period comprises:

determining a maintenance window following the end of the predetermined time period (**The original request includes the disconnection time, which can be used as the maintenance window; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12**); and

disconnecting the at least one logical circuit during the maintenance window (**The end time of the active circuit is interpreted as disconnection of the circuit; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12**).

Regarding claim 15, Sibbitt teaches a system for provisioning logical circuits for intermittent use in a data network, the system comprising:

at least one network device (**Digital cross-connect; See Fig. 1, #11**) to establish a communications path for at least one logical circuit in the data network (**When the time comes to set up that connection, the controller will wake up, send the commands to the individual cross-connects so that they will make the connections and effect the end-to-end circuit from one customer premise to another; See col. 4, lines 10-15**); and

a network management module (**network controller; See Fig. 1, #40**) to:

receive at least one customer order for routing data in the data network during a predetermined time period (An end user at any node can log into the controller and send instructions as to the bandwidth desired between nodes and the exact time that such bandwidth will be required; See col. 2, lines 36-39);

provision the at least one logical circuit for routing the customer data during the predetermined time period (The controller determines that the end user has authorization to use the requested bandwidth during the time of the requested period and then looks for channels of the communication facilities between the end points requested which will be idle during the prospective time period. Once the path is identified, then available bandwidth through the path must be selected and reserved. Once this is accomplished, the prospective routing is scheduled for use by the initiating end user during the requested time period; See col. 2, lines 40-46 and 49-53);

add the at least one logical circuit to a deletion batch (The original request includes the disconnection time, therefore all connections that are scheduled to be disconnected at the same time will be in the same deletion batch; See Fig. 10, 1007 and Fig. 12); and

disconnect the at least one logical circuit following the end of the predetermined time period (**The end time of the active circuit is interpreted as disconnection of the circuit; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12).**

While Sibbitt teaches of looking for and reserving channels associated with the communication facilities in the path identified, Sibbitt fails to explicitly teach of the various communication facilities associated with the path.

Wilkes teaches of the communication facilities being used. In Fig. 3A, Wilkes shows the two LATAs and the IEC as well as the paths associated with the LATAs and the links between the LATAs and the IEC (**LATA#1, LATA#2 and IEC; See Fig. 3A).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the system of Sibbitt to include the LATAs and the IEC along with the communication paths associated with the three components taught by Wilkes in order to provide the detailed communication path being used by the circuit in the network.

Regarding claim 16, Sibbitt further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the network management module, in provisioning the at least one logical circuit, is operative to provision the at least one logical circuit prior to the start of the predetermined time period **(At the scheduled period of time, or slightly therebefore, the controller begins an assessment of the continued availability of the previously selected channels to insure that quality communications will be possible during the scheduled period; See col. 2, lines 54-57).**

Regarding claim 17, Sibbitt further teaches the system of claim 16, wherein the network management module, in provisioning the at least one logical circuit prior to the start of the predetermined time period, is operative to:

determine a maintenance window prior to the start of the predetermined time period **(The original request includes the connection time, which can be used as the maintenance window; See Fig. 10, #1006 and Fig. 12);** and

provision the at least one logical circuit during the maintenance window **(Provisioning the circuit occurs during the time requested; See Fig. 10, #1006 and Fig. 12).**

Regarding claim 18, Sibbitt further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the network management module, in disconnecting the at least one logical circuit following the end of the predetermined time period, is operative to:

determine a maintenance window following the end of the predetermined time period (**The original request includes the disconnection time, which can be used as the maintenance window; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12**); and
disconnect the at least one logical circuit during the maintenance window (**The end time of the active circuit is interpreted as disconnection of the circuit; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12**).

Regarding claim 26, Sibbitt teaches a method for provisioning logical circuits for routing logical circuit data in a data network during a predetermined time period, the method comprising:

receiving at least one customer order for routing the logical data in the data network during the predetermined time period (**An end user at any node can log into the controller and send instructions as to the bandwidth desired between nodes and the exact time that such bandwidth will be required; See col. 2, lines 36-39**);

determining a maintenance window prior to the start of the predetermined time period (**The original request includes the connection time, which can be used as the maintenance window; See Fig. 10, #1006 and Fig. 12**);

provisioning the at least one logical circuit during the maintenance window (**The controller determines that the end user has authorization to use the requested bandwidth during the time of the requested period and then looks for channels of the communication facilities between the end points requested which will be idle during the prospective time period. Once the path is identified, then available bandwidth through the path must be selected and reserved. Once this is accomplished, the prospective routing is scheduled for use by the initiating end user during the requested time period; See col. 2, lines 40-46 and 49-53;**

determining a maintenance window following the end of the predetermined time period (**The original request includes the disconnection time, which can be used as the maintenance window; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12;** and

disconnecting the at least one logical circuit during the maintenance window (**The end time of the active circuit is interpreted as disconnection of the circuit; See Fig. 10, #1007 and Fig. 12).**

While Sibbitt teaches of looking for and reserving channels associated with the communication facilities in the path identified, Sibbitt fails to explicitly teach of the various communication facilities associated with the path.

Wilkes teaches of the communication facilities being used. In Fig. 3A, Wilkes shows the two LATAs and the IEC as well as the paths associated with the LATAs and the links between the LATAs and the IEC (**LATA#1, LATA#2 and IEC; See Fig. 3A**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Sibbitt to include the LATAs and the IEC along with the communication paths associated with the three components taught by Wilkes in order to provide the detailed communication path being used by the circuit in the network.

6. Claims 6-7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibbitt in view of Wilkes in further view of Hollman et al. (**U.S. Patent No. 7,146,000**), hereinafter referred to as Hollman.

Regarding claim 6, while Sibbitt teaches of the disk that contains the data description of the network controlled by the controller (**See col. 4, lines 49-51**), Sibbitt fails to teach of generating trap data. Sibbitt in view of Wilkes further fails to teach of generating trap data for each logical circuit during the predetermined time period, wherein the trap data comprises utilization statistics.

Hollman teaches generating trap data for each logical circuit during the predetermined time period, wherein the trap data comprises utilization statistics for the at least one logical circuit **(The routing engine determines the available capacity between the source and destination, which is equivalent to the disk of Sibbitt. Service type and bandwidth information dictate which specific routing policy rules to use. The routing process then builds a capacity graph including only the filtered set of capacity links between the source and destination. The capacity graph is interpreted as having the utilization statistics for the circuit connection and that would be obtained during the provisioning in the predetermined time period and be maintained as part of the status information indicated by Sibbitt; See Fig. 10, #1008; col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2 lines 1-3).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include generating trap data for each logical circuit during the predetermined time period, wherein the trap data comprises utilization statistics taught by Hollman in order to constantly manage the bandwidth.

Regarding claim 7, Sibbitt in view of Wilkes still fails to teach of the utilization statistics including the percent utilization of the circuit during the predetermined time period.

Hollman teaches of the utilization statistics comprising the percent utilization of the at least one logical circuit during the predetermined time period (**The capacity graph is interpreted to have the percent of the utilization for the circuit connection; See col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2 lines 1-3).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include the utilization statistics comprising percent utilization taught by Hollman in order to constantly manage the bandwidth.

Regarding claim 19, Sibbitt teaches the system of claim 15, further comprising a logical element module (**a disk which includes the data description of the network; See Fig. 1, 43 and col. 4, lines 49-50**), in communication with the at least one network device and the network management module.

Sibbitt in view of Wilkes fails to teach of the module receiving trap data generated by the network device.

Hollman teaches of a logical element module (**A routing engine, which is equivalent to the disk of Sibbitt, as this is relied upon to obtain the capacity and availability which is inclusive of a data description of the network; See col. 5, lines 40-43**) to receive trap data generated by the at least one network device, wherein the trap data comprises a percent utilization of the at least one logical circuit during the predetermined time period (**The capacity graph is interpreted as having the utilization statistics for the circuit connection; See col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2 lines 1-3**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the system of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include a logical element module that receives trap data comprising a percent utilization taught by Hollman in order to constantly manage bandwidth.

7. Claims 8-11 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibbitt in view of Wilkes in further view of Chiu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,689), hereinafter referred to as Chiu.

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Sibbitt in view of Wilkes fails to teach the method/system of claims 1 and 15, respectively, wherein the customer order comprises a quality of service parameter for the logical circuit.

Chiu teaches of provisioning the quality of service requested (**Quality of service could be implemented to "fairly" prioritize the various data received; See col. 5, lines 7-10**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method/system of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include quality of service parameters taught by Chiu in order to maintain an acceptable level of service for data transmission.

Regarding claims 9 and 21, Sibbitt in view of Wilkes fails to teach the method/system of claims 8 and 20, wherein the quality of service parameter comprises at least one of an unspecified bit rate; a variable bit rate; and a committed bit rate.

Chiu teaches of various quality of service parameters **(The service class may include CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, ABR or UBR; See col. 5, lines 15-19).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method/system of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include quality of service parameters taught by Chiu in order to maintain an acceptable level of service for data transmission.

Regarding claims 10-11 and 22-23, Sibbitt in view of Wilkes fails to teach the method/system of claims 1 and 15, wherein the at least one logical circuit is a permanent virtual circuit or switched virtual circuit.

Chiu teaches of the circuit being a PVC or SVC **(Two types of virtual connections are PVCs and SVCs).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method/system of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include the circuits being PVCs or SVCs taught by Chiu in order to reduce the amount of resources being used.

8. Claims 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibbitt in view of Wilkes in further view of Naven et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,810,043), hereinafter referred to as Naven.

Regarding claim 27, Sibbitt teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

receiving a second customer order for routing second data in the data network for a second time period (**Schedule ID 111; See Fig. 10**), wherein the at least one customer order is received at a first time of receipt (**Schedule ID 113; See Fig. 10**) and the second customer order is received at a second time of receipt (**In Fig. 10, multiple requests are received, some of which are on separate dates, such as Schedule IDs 113 and 111**).

While Sibbitt teaches of the requests, there is no set time range set up to determine the maintenance window. Sibbitt in view of Wilkes fails to teach of selecting a first maintenance window to provision the circuit based on a first time of receipt being within a first range corresponding to the maintenance window, and selecting the maintenance window for the second order based on the time of receipt of the request.

Naven teaches of:

selecting a first maintenance window to provision the at least one logical circuit based on the first time of receipt being within a first time of receipt range corresponding to the first maintenance window **(The master calendar holds entries corresponding to events that are to occur within a preselected master-calendar scheduling range, therefore all requests that are received are input into the master calendar to be set up for provisioning at the scheduled time; See Abstract lines 3-5);**

when the second time of receipt corresponding to the second customer order is within the first time of receipt range, selecting the first maintenance window to provision a second logical circuit corresponding to the second customer order **(If the second request fits into the time of the master-calendar scheduling range then it is provided the same maintenance window as the first request; See Abstract lines 3-5);** and

when the second time of receipt corresponding to the second customer order is not within the first time of receipt range, selecting a second maintenance window to provision the second logical circuit **(If the interval between the current time and a desired scheduling time exceeds said scheduling range, the entry is put in the slave calendar until the scheduling range for that request arrives; See Abstract lines 5-7 and 10-12).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include

selecting a first maintenance window to provision the circuit based on a first time of receipt being within a first range corresponding to the maintenance window, and selecting the maintenance window for the second order based on the time of receipt of the request taught by Naven in order to allow various connections to be made without requiring complicated processing of the calendar entries when the scheduling results in widely disparate intervals.

Regarding claim 28, Sibbitt in view of Wilkes further fails to teach the method of claim 27, wherein the first maintenance window occurs during a time range during which a plurality of logical connections assigned to the first maintenance window are provisioned based on customer orders corresponding to the plurality of logical connections having been received during the first time of receipt range.

Naven teaches of the first maintenance window occurring during a time range when a plurality of connections are provisioned based on the first time of receipt range (See Abstract lines 3-5).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include the first maintenance window occurring during a time range during which a plurality of logical connections assigned to the first maintenance window are provisioned based on customer orders corresponding to the plurality of logical connections having been received during the first time of receipt range taught by Naven in order to allow for

multiple circuits to be provisioned at the same time thereby increases network productivity.

Regarding claim 29, Sibbitt further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the network management module is further to:

receive a second customer order for routing second data in the data network for a second time period (**Schedule ID 111; See Fig. 10**), wherein the at least one customer order is received at a first time of receipt (**Schedule ID 113; See Fig. 10**) and the second customer order is received at a second time of receipt (**In Fig. 10, multiple requests are received, some of which are on separate dates, such as Schedule IDs 113 and 111**).

While Sibbitt teaches of the requests, there is no set time range set up to determine the maintenance window. Sibbitt in view of Wilkes fails to teach of selecting a first maintenance window to provision the circuit based on a first time of receipt being within a first range corresponding to the maintenance window, and selecting the maintenance window for the second order based on the time of receipt of the request.

Naven teaches of:

select a first maintenance window to provision the at least one logical circuit based on the first time of receipt being within a first time of receipt range corresponding to the first maintenance window (**The master calendar holds entries corresponding to events that are to occur within a preselected master-**

calendar scheduling range, therefore all requests that are received are input into the master calendar to be set up for provisioning at the scheduled time; See Abstract lines 3-5);

when the second time of receipt corresponding to the second customer order is within the first time of receipt range, select the first maintenance window to provision a second logical circuit corresponding to the second customer order **(If the second request fits into the time of the master-calendar scheduling range then it is provided the same maintenance window as the first request; See Abstract lines 3-5); and**

when the second time of receipt corresponding to the second customer order is not within the first time of receipt range, select a second maintenance window to provision the second logical circuit **(If the interval between the current time and a desired scheduling time exceeds said scheduling range, the entry is put in the slave calendar until the scheduling range for that request arrives; See Abstract lines 5-7 and 10-12).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the system of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include selecting a first maintenance window to provision the circuit based on a first time of receipt being within a first range corresponding to the maintenance window, and selecting the maintenance window for the second order based on the time of receipt of the request taught by Naven in order to allow various connections to be made without

requiring complicated processing of the calendar entries when the scheduling results in widely disparate intervals.

Regarding claim 30, Sibbitt in view of Wilkes further fails to teach the system of claim 29, wherein the first maintenance window occurs during a time range during which a plurality of logical connections assigned to the first maintenance window are provisioned based on customer orders corresponding to the plurality of logical connections having been received during the first time of receipt range.

Naven teaches of the first maintenance window occurring during a time range when a plurality of connections are provisioned based on the first time of receipt range (**See Abstract lines 3-5**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the system of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include the first maintenance window occurring during a time range during which a plurality of logical connections assigned to the first maintenance window are provisioned based on customer orders corresponding to the plurality of logical connections having been received during the first time of receipt range taught by Naven in order to allow for multiple circuits to be provisioned at the same time thereby increases network productivity.

Regarding claim 31, Sibbitt further teaches the method of claim 26, further comprising:

receiving a second customer order for routing second data in the data network for a second predetermined time period (**Schedule ID 111; See Fig. 10**), wherein the at least one customer order is received at a first time of receipt (**Schedule ID 113; See Fig. 10**) and the second customer order is received at a second time of receipt (**In Fig. 10, multiple requests are received, some of which are on separate dates, such as Schedule IDs 113 and 111**).

While Sibbitt teaches of the requests, there is no set time range set up to determine the maintenance window. Sibbitt in view of Wilkes fails to teach of selecting a first maintenance window to provision the circuit based on a first time of receipt being within a first range corresponding to the maintenance window, and selecting the maintenance window for the second order based on the time of receipt of the request.

Naven teaches of:

selecting a first maintenance window to provision the at least one logical circuit based on the first time of receipt being within a first time of receipt range corresponding to the first maintenance window (**The master calendar holds entries corresponding to events that are to occur within a preselected master-calendar scheduling range, therefore all requests that are received are input into the master calendar to be set up for provisioning at the scheduled time; See Abstract lines 3-5**);

when the second time of receipt corresponding to the second customer order is within the first time of receipt range, selecting the first maintenance window to provision a second logical circuit corresponding to the second customer order **(If the second request fits into the time of the master-calendar scheduling range then it is provided the same maintenance window as the first request; See Abstract lines 3-5);** and

when the second time of receipt corresponding to the second customer order is not within the first time of receipt range, selecting a second maintenance window to provision the second logical circuit **(If the interval between the current time and a desired scheduling time exceeds said scheduling range, the entry is put in the slave calendar until the scheduling range for that request arrives; See Abstract lines 5-7 and 10-12).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include selecting a first maintenance window to provision the circuit based on a first time of receipt being within a first range corresponding to the maintenance window, and selecting the maintenance window for the second order based on the time of receipt of the request taught by Naven in order to allow various connections to be made without requiring complicated processing of the calendar entries when the scheduling results in widely disparate intervals.

Regarding claim 32, Sibbitt in view of Wilkes further fails to teach the method of claim 31, wherein the first maintenance window occurs during a time range during which a plurality of logical connections assigned to the first maintenance window are provisioned based on customer orders corresponding to the plurality of logical connections having been received during the first time of receipt range.

Naven teaches of the first maintenance window occurring during a time range when a plurality of connections are provisioned based on the first time of receipt range (See Abstract lines 3-5).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Sibbitt in view of Wilkes to include the first maintenance window occurring during a time range during which a plurality of logical connections assigned to the first maintenance window are provisioned based on customer orders corresponding to the plurality of logical connections having been received during the first time of receipt range taught by Naven in order to allow for multiple circuits to be provisioned at the same time thereby increases network productivity.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 15-23 and 26-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

11. Any response to this action should be **faxed** to (571) 273-8300 or **mailed** to:

Commissioner of Patents,
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHLEY L. SHIVERS whose telephone number is (571) 270-3523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chirag Shah can be reached on (571) 272-3144. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ashley L Shivers/
Examiner, Art Unit 2419
3/10/2009

**/Chirag G Shah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419**